



## COVER SHEET

---

Spurgeon, Christina (2006) Advertising and the New Search Media. *Media International Australia* No. 119(May):pp. 51-61.

Accessed from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au>

Copyright 2006 Christina Spurgeon

## **Advertising and the New Search Media**

Article published in *Media International Australia*, No. 119, May 2006, pp. 51-61.

By Christina Spurgeon  
([c.spurgeon@qut.edu.au](mailto:c.spurgeon@qut.edu.au))

### **Abstract**

This article takes a co-evolutionary approach to considering the influence of internet cultures and revenue sources on the development of the new commercial search media. The extent to which advertising revenues can be relied upon as a defining characteristic of commercial media in the global era is also problematised. A comparative consideration of the cases of Yahoo!, Google and Sensis pays particular attention to informational forms of advertising and the rhetorical, if not strategic importance of small advertisers. Also considered are the disruptive impacts of new modes of interaction upon the established social relations of media, advertisers, and consumers, in the production, circulation and uses of symbolic power. While new search media business models are suggestive of new strategies for civilising advertising and capital more generally, the resilience and adaptability of the advertiser-funded business model provides an important point of historical continuity between the new search media and the politics and economics of modern mass ('old') media. The more things change, the more they also seem to be at risk of remaining the same.

### **Advertising and the New Search Media**

Over the last decade online publishers have formed new industry alliances to advance their interests. An Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB) has been established in no less than fifteen countries in North America and Europe and, since September 2005, Australia. A mix of established mass and new online media proprietors is represented in IAB memberships. For example, while the managing director of Yahoo! Australia & NZ, was the inaugural chairman of the Australian chapter, other founding members included Fairfax Digital, News Interactive, ninemsn, Google, and Telstra's Sensis. Although competitors, they also share a common interest in the generic promotion to advertisers of their online properties. The IAB movement reflects a maturing, and self-selecting differentiation of advertiser-funded online media from more general e-commerce developments. This industry-based need for increased precision in identifying the new commercial media institutions has yet to be matched by work in new media and communication studies. This article begins this task by identifying and evaluating the "new rules, procedures of production, management and economic calculation" (Castells 2001, 56) that differentiate new media publishers from 'old' modern mass media. In considering the particular cases of three search media – Yahoo!, Google and Sensis – it is also possible to see how the co-evolution of advertising and new media is tempered by the cultures that produced the internet. New modes of interaction disrupt established social relations of media, advertisers, and consumers in the production, circulation and uses of symbolic power. Yet the advertiser-funded business model has proven to be both resilient and adaptable in the face of these changes. As the formation of the IAB illustrates, historical roots in mass

communications or internet cultures are easily overcome in order to focus on their collective interest in the share of total advertising expenditure they command.

Important trends are emerging in the distribution of advertising expenditures between different media. In 2004, online media's share of advertising income was just under 4 percent in the USA and the UK (PriceWaterHouseCoopers c2004; IABUK c2005). While this may seem small relative to the accompanying new media industry hype, it is the extraordinary rates of advertising revenue share growth that have boosted the value of new media properties, and which make mass media proprietors nervous. In the US, online advertising grew by 33 percent between 2003 and 2004. In the same period it grew by 60 percent in the UK, and 63 percent in Australia. (ABVS 2005). Advertising expenditure in so-called interactive online media now exceeds outdoor, cinema and even magazine advertising expenditures in some countries, and is predicted to rival the aggregate advertising revenues of broadcast media by the end of the decade. In the USA, 94 percent of the \$US9.6 billion spent in online advertising occurred in the top ten online media properties (PriceWaterHouseCoopers c2004). Reflected in current online advertising growth rates is the present misalignment of advertising expenditure in online media with levels of actual internet usage, which means online expenditures remain disproportionately low. The demographics of online users, who tend to be young, educated and employed, also favour growth in online advertising.

These shifts in advertising spending patterns lag behind, and respond to, historical changes in patterns of media usage. For example, there has been a long term decline in readerships for certain types of newspaper and audiences for certain types of television (for example, Turner 2004, 44). Changes in advertising expenditure are also responses to the general expansion of the mediasphere in recent decades. Developments such as multichannel and niche media, new games and entertainment platforms in addition to the internet, and mobile communications, require advertisers to spend more, across more media, in order to reach proportionately the same consumer numbers and demographics that mass media once delivered. Thus the trend is also for advertising expenditures to expand along with the new social spaces in which advertising can circulate. Other applications which cede varying degrees of systemic control to end-users, such as electronic program guides and personal video recorders, increase the capacity of consumers to escape broadcast advertising altogether. These developments also feed the co-evolution of advertising and commercial media forms, practices and industry structures. This article considers the particular example of the new search media.

Since the mid-1990s when the internet began to rapidly commercialise, advertising has provided the main means by which it has been made available to users beyond universities and personal computer clubs. David Marshall (2004, 59) observes that where content is the "free lunch" of mass media, communication tools are the free lunch of the internet. Despite this difference, "evidence of as many people as possible viewing the website so that their viewing can be sold on to advertisers," has become the organising principle of internet-based media. This article looks at some of the new advertising-related

communication tools that have been developed as a part of the free lunch for search media end-users and advertisers.

There are three main types of online advertising: banner and display advertising, search engine and directory advertising, and classified advertising. Banner and display advertising attracted many advertisers to the internet from the mid-1990s, but also drove them away when its effectiveness could not be established. There is renewed interest in the advertising potential of these forms of 'rich' media. For the moment, however, the other types of online advertising – and the new media that support them – are experiencing the higher growth rates. The boom in online classified advertising is due to the various ways in which the increased flexibility and discoverability of this form of advertising serves to increase end-user control over many aspects of daily life, including the ways that people now look for work, a home, transport, and even love. The growth in online classified advertising also shows that these 'rivers of gold' are much longer and more varied than ever imagined by modern newspapers, the first home of classified advertising. As argued elsewhere, the consequences of changes in classified advertising for the print media are uneven (Spurgeon 2003). Metropolitan dailies have been hit particularly hard by classified advertising losses, while the legitimacy of both the suburban throw-away newspaper and the online classified service appears to be gaining ground with both advertisers and readerships. For the moment, the revenues and growth rates for search media advertising exceed online classified advertising. For this reason this article pays particular attention to the new search media.

Corresponding with growth in online classified advertising and the development of the new search media represented by the IAB memberships, informational advertising forms have also prospered. Informational advertising characteristically deals in facts, and relies upon a rational appeal (for example, Mattelart 2002, 204; Ogilvy 2004). Small advertisers, with limited resources, are frequent users of the informational approach to advertising. They often deal directly with media and, because there are so many of them, can be more resource-intensive for media to manage than larger advertisers. Larger advertisers who also make use of informational advertising often rely upon specialist intermediaries, such as recruitment agencies, to broker media and end-user relationships. While informational advertising is lucrative, it does not have the same status as the more high-profile creative forms of brand advertising. Consequently, informational forms of advertising, and the particular interests of small and informational advertisers, have tended to be neglected or overlooked by mass media for a number of decades. This is another reason why new online competitors have moved into these advertising markets with extraordinary speed.

The commercial success of new search media is due in large measure to their comparative responsiveness to the interests of small and informational advertisers, as well as end-users. Combined with consumer preferences for using the internet to find and then 'pull' information, rather than to select from what is 'pushed' to them, the new search media are proving to be very effective in making large and small advertisers more discoverable and accessible to internet users. Manuel Castells (2001) has argued that the communal cultures derived from the techno-meritocratic elites, in which the internet was invented, have also

provided the foundations for the commercial uses of the internet. Consequently, he argues, “the Internet transformed business as much, if not more, than business transformed the Internet” (55). This transformation is now widely characterised as the ‘new economy’. The specifics of the new, advertiser-funded search media, considered here, show how advertising industry structures and practices are changed in the process of adapting to the new economy. They also allow us to extend the media studies concern for media citizenship to a consider the limits of internet use as a civilising influence upon advertisers in this transformation. As the following three case studies show, there are interesting and important differences in the approaches taken to balancing the interests of end-users and different types of advertisers in the new search media. This variety is strongly influenced by the relationship of individual publishers to the various cultures that shaped the internet in advance of its rapid commercialisation from the mid-1990s. It is also the cast that the business models of search media are far from settled, that there are significant tensions within these organisations over how to resolve their own economic frameworks, and that they are consequently constantly developing and re-developing their market approaches. The following accounts of Yahoo!, Google and Sensis are necessarily constrained by these dynamics. However, there are also important parallels with the *longue durée* of modern commercial mass media which serve to limit the extent of both end-user control and its civilising influence.

### **The first advertiser-funded search media: Yahoo!**

Yahoo! was one of the earliest new media companies to turn profitable when, in 1998, it reported an \$US18 million profit on a \$US245 million turnover that had been generated substantially from advertising. (Yahoo! 2000, F-18). Established in 1994 and publicly listed in 1996, Yahoo! aimed to help integrate the internet into daily life by providing an online destination where people would find all they needed or were looking for. This mission betrays Yahoo!’s origins in an entrepreneurial interpretation of virtual communitarian culture. This supports “horizontal, free communication” (Castells 2001, 54), “self-directed networking” (55) and the capacity for anyone to find their destination on the internet, and, “if not found, to create and post his or her own information, thus inducing a network” (55). In contrast to its main competitor, America Online (AOL), Yahoo! was not a proprietary network or internet service provider. It provided a range of communications services to consumers, such as email, in exchange for registration information. In a variation on the spirit of the open source movement, Yahoo! gave away access to communications services. More precisely, these services could be made free to end-users because advertisers were willing to pay Yahoo! for access to its end-users. Like AOL, Yahoo! had the look and feel of an internet portal and included curated lists and service directories, but in fact it was one of the first new commercial search media, so-called because at its heart is the search engine functionality which attracts and structures end-user interaction. Unlike the modern print and broadcast media, the registration capacity of the internet meant that Yahoo! could account to advertisers in detail for their audiences. By December 1997 Yahoo! was recording 65 million page impressions per day from 20 million unique monthly visitors (Yahoo! 1997). The level of detail about end-user media usage that

Yahoo! could harvest from its websites was unprecedented in advertising, and drove interest in the internet as an advertising medium.

However, Yahoo! advertising revenues suffered significantly following the dotcom collapse in April 2000. Many Yahoo! advertisers at that time were themselves internet-related companies, and Yahoo! experienced a sudden contraction when many failed. Yahoo!'s own share price also collapsed, even though site traffic volumes continued to grow. By the end of 2000 Yahoo! claimed 180 million unique visitors worldwide and 900 million average daily page impressions (Yahoo! 2000). Recovery for Yahoo! was slowed by one of the worst-ever global slumps in advertising in 2002, which was felt throughout the advertising and commercial media industries. A complicating factor for new advertiser-supported media in this period was the lack of coherent industry standards for assessing the performance of online media, which also contributed to the sluggish new media recovery. Related to this was the questionable effectiveness of, and levels of end-user resistance to, the early dominant forms of online advertising, notably the banner ad and the pop-up.

Since 2001, when former Warner Brothers chief executive, Terry Semel, took over day-to-day management and the company re-located to Hollywood, Yahoo! has attempted to diversify income sources for a variety of reasons, including its perceived over-reliance on advertising. By 2004 Yahoo! was turning over \$US3.6 billion, more than double its 2003 revenues (Yahoo! 2004, Financial Section). This income comes from two distinct streams. Marketing services accounted for the best part of \$US3 billion and included activities such as keyword advertising and a range of other search media, including affiliate websites. The remainder came from fees for premium content services charged on a user-pays basis. Although it aspires to grow this side of its business, the proportionately small contribution that premium rate services contribute to the bottom line suggests that Yahoo! has a very long way to go before this ambition is realised.

### **Hacking the advertiser-funded model: Google**

Google is another of the new search media which now shares with modern commercial media a business model that relies upon advertising as a principle revenue stream (Google 2004). In the few short years since its establishment, Google has expanded quickly and become a globally recognised brand and household name. Google has also been rapidly incorporated into the lexicon of digital popular culture as a verb to describe the act of internet-based searching. Google raised \$US23 billion when it made its initial public offering (IPO) in August 2004. Less than a year later, Google was valued at \$US81 billion. This exceeded the listed value of older media and entertainment corporations, including Time Warner, which have arguably accumulated far more substantial assets than the new media upstart. However, the 2004 market appraisal of Google did not necessarily signal a return to the overheating of new media stock of the 2000 dotcom bust. Even though shareholders have yet to see dividends, Google's success is due to renewed confidence in the advertiser-funded search media, and the substantial alterations to the business of advertising that have been engineered in the new search media environment of Google.

Initially, Google's Stanford University research student inventors struggled to licence their unique web search technology to third parties. However, the technological superiority of their search engine was quickly recognised in the informal networks of peer review that constitute the internet marketplace of ideas. As the numbers of Google users grew exponentially it became clear that Google's commercial success would come from evolving into an advertiser-funded medium. Many elements of the hacker culture of the early internet were applied to the task of improving the fit of advertising to the internet. Prominent among these innovations is the way that advertising space (known as inventory in advertising parlance) adjacent to search results is dynamically sold to advertisers and then presented to end-users. Advertiser entries are incorporated into the overall flow of Google search results but they are also clearly distinguished from unpaid search results as 'sponsored links' that run down the right hand side of the search results page. Google search results are also presented in a clutter-free, informational format, which is a markedly different design approach to the portal. They are limited to brief entries for the purpose of enhancing speedy access to internet-based resources related to the search term. This design approach encourages end-user perceptions of Google as an accurate, authoritative, timely and comprehensive information source – qualities which have also been associated with the best of the agenda-setting mass media.

Google's origins in academic and hacker internet culture are also apparent in its dual commitment to producing better search products and to addressing end-user ethical expectations about the role of advertising in advertiser-funded media. The strength of its market position means that Google is able to insist that advertising is conducted on its terms, which it also perceives to be agreeable to Google end-users. A simple illustration of this is found in Google's active support for consumer resistance to online forms of advertising that try to circumvent end-user control. Search media often offer downloadable toolbars that facilitate customisation of user interaction. Google's toolbar includes a tool that will block a particularly annoying type of internet ad, the pop-up.

Another example of the ways in which Google insists that advertisers adapt to the internet, rather than vice versa, is reflected in the emergence of a whole new sub-category of advertising services. Search optimisers help advertisers with strategies for ensuring that their ads will appear at the top, or near the top, of search results. There are parallels to be drawn between these advertising services and internet "cracker" subcultures which, according to Castells, make the wider "hacker" culture of the internet "nervous" (2001, 52). Although not actually criminal, this type of service has the potential to compromise Google's reputation. This is another reason why maintaining a search product focus lies at the core of Google's competitive advantage amongst search media. The challenge of search optimisation also highlights the ambivalence that is often found in Google's relations with agencies, and between advertising agencies and online publishers more generally. Like other online publishers, Google has taken measures to change the advertising value chain in ways that reduce the opportunities for agency involvement. Most recently Google has begun to pay rebates to advertisers for advertising they place with Google, instead of rewarding agencies with commissions for clients they bring to Google. This is a major break with dominant mass media remuneration practices where agencies

have both sold media to advertisers and advertisers to media. Agencies argue Google's new agency remuneration model will favour the involvement in search media of a reduced number of large agencies and their large advertising clients, and that it potentially discriminates against small advertisers because they have little choice but to deal directly with Google (Sinclair 2005).

### **Commercialising a public good: Sensis**

While Yahoo! and Google are quite distinctive in terms of business orientation, organisational culture, and market position, they share a number of common traits, including the fact that they trade upon their *global* recognition. This contrasts with the third search medium considered here which is using the *local* possibilities of advertiser-funded search media as a foundation for market entry. Sensis is wholly owned by Telstra, Australia's largest telecommunications carrier. Until the mid-1980s Telstra was the monopoly provider. As part of its public service remit, it maintained and distributed telephone directories for all local call areas of Australia. It also provided advertising services to businesses through its *Yellow Pages* directories, which have become an important profit centre and a valuable asset in the emerging information economy. The global value of directories was estimated to be \$US25 billion in 2001 (Raphael, Bacey and Clark 2003, 1684-1685); Sensis revenues were \$AUD1.3 billion in 2004 (Telstra 2004, 19). This was equivalent to approximately 10 percent of all Australian main media advertising expenditure in the same year. Advertising and directory listings were worth more to Telstra in 2004 than declining national call revenues (worth \$AUD1.1 billion) and almost as much as local telephone call revenues (\$AUD1.5 billion), where Telstra still retained a monopoly.

Perhaps the first true search medium, telephone directories have been an important advertising medium for local, small and medium-sized advertisers. Because the telephone is an essential tool of business, telephone companies have also been historically well-placed to successfully convince those that may not otherwise do so, to advertise. In the main, monopoly telecommunications companies were curiously slow to use new information and communications technologies to improve directory services. This was one consequence of a larger tension that Manuel Castells (2001, 26-27) attributes to the development of global private data networks from the 1970s. These only became viable with the development of internet-type protocols that were also being used to integrate research networks in the US. Private networks, including private research networks, challenged the legitimacy of the monopoly as the natural way to organise national telecommunications systems, an approach that was particularly strong in the European approach to state-owned telecommunications infrastructure. The French Minitel system, established in 1982, was an important exception to the hiatus in the development of public data networks that otherwise prevailed. Unlike the internet, Minitel was based on principles of centralised government ownership and control.

Although the internet ultimately won out, the Minitel initiative also provided a model for addressing the various limitations of hard copy directories, including their bulk, high production and distribution costs, and problems of disposal. Database-driven, networked solutions to these problems offered a number of



advantages, such as timely updating rather than updating dictated by the demands of an annual production cycle. They also paved the way for this form of public information service to be transformed into a significant new commercial media asset in a competitive telecommunications market. This is because competition reduces carriage services to commodity status, and information-based value added services emerge as the new sources of opportunity for developing new revenue streams. The commercial value of online directories, which are derived in the first instance from the networks that telecommunications carriers own and operate, arise from the array of benefits they can deliver to advertisers – especially small advertisers – as Sensis Marketing Manager, Natalie Milnes, explains:

From an advertiser's perspective what you used to have to do, and still do, is buy an ad in the book for 12 months at a flat rate up-front without knowing if you were going to recoup the costs of that ad. For small businesses in particular, where they don't make those sorts of decisions lightly, they need to have a fair degree of confidence that they are going to get their money back, or that the benefit is going to outweigh the cost. So search marketing is fantastic in that sense because there is almost no risk. You know that everybody who clicks on your listing is a qualified lead. They are actually looking to purchase. That's why they have clicked on your listing. You don't have to worry about segmentation because they self-segment by virtue of the fact that they are after your products and services. And when they click through you are paying a pretty minimal fee, and that's a lead you then have ultimate control over in terms of whether you can convert that to a sale. So it's quite a different proposition to anything we have ever had before. The other thing about search is that it's probably the first relationship that's been a 'win-win-win' situation for everybody involved, from the user to the small business person who is advertising in them, to the service provider. The user gets a relevant outcome for their search. The advertiser obviously gets a qualified lead and the service provider gets the revenue that's associated with that. It's quite a balanced relationship and doesn't sacrifice the user's needs in order to just generate revenue.

(Nathalie Milnes, personal interview 11 August 2005)

Thus Sensis reconciles public interest in its online search media while simultaneously expanding its commercial potential in advance of the full privatisation of Telstra. Sensis may not yet have the global profile of either Yahoo! or Google, but by positioning itself at a narrower point in the "search funnel" than its high-profile competitors (Milnes 2005) it aims to develop a market position that will also appeal to national advertisers. While consumers may use search engines for a variety of purposes, they tend to use only a very small number of search engines. Advertisers, on the other hand, use search advertising to drive traffic and transactions. Sensis wants to be the search engine Australians use when they want to make a transaction, rather than the search engine they use for other types of searches. To this end, Sensis has been consolidating its search media portfolio through a program of carefully targeted acquisitions, and building its potential for location-based e-commerce and m-commerce in the process. Sensis now faces the challenge of integrating into a seamless online experience properties such as the various *The Trading Post*

classifieds mastheads and associated websites, the *UBD* Street Directories, as well as the *White* and *Yellow Pages*. For the time being, Sensis remains wholly within Telstra, although many former monopoly carriers around the world have long since spun off their directory services into separate businesses.

### **The strategic importance of small advertisers**

Monetising small advertisers has always been a difficult task for a variety of reasons. The sales forces required to sell media to small advertisers can be large and not particularly cost-effective. Generating traffic in the first instance is one of the biggest challenges that media generally face when dealing with small advertisers. For these reasons, small advertisers are proving to be something of an Achilles heel for modern mass media. It is here that the new search media have commenced their assault on the dominance of modern mass media. Search media such as Yahoo!, Google and Sensis have achieved significant efficiencies in managing small advertisers. Along with numerous online classified specialists, they now compete with newspapers, especially metropolitan dailies, which have become heavily reliant on classified advertising as cover price incomes have been eroded by declining circulations. It is useful to return to the example of Google example to illustrate some of the ways in which the new search media can be small advertiser friendly.

Google offers two main advertising services, AdWords and AdSense. AdWords is a keyword auctioning service and the means by which advertisers buy space on Google and affiliated media. It provides a range of advertising management tools, including performance monitoring and reporting. Although AdWords is offered on a self-service basis, advertising agencies also provide specialist intermediary services in this area, as has already been mentioned. In addition to appearing in Google search results, advertiser access to other online inventory can also be managed through AdWords. This includes, for example, G-mail (Google e-mail) footers and the inventory of publishers affiliated to Google through the second service, Google AdSense. Online publishers, large and small, use this service if they want inventory brokered by Google. AdSense is organised as an affiliate marketing program and uses contextual search algorithms to match advertising to keywords appearing in other online media. It also dynamically distributes this advertising content to affiliated websites and publishers, many of whom would not otherwise have the capacity to sell or manage advertising.

### **A civilising influence on advertisers?**

Services such as AdWords and AdSense automate the matching of advertisements and inventory at market-determined rates. They make it relatively easy to achieve an extensive targeted reach for an ad for very low costs to the advertiser. They also hold out the hope that online media businesses of all sizes can generate advertising revenue streams. Larger online publishers have reported that contextual advertising enables them to monetise news, entertainment and sports pages which they have found difficult to sell directly to advertisers. Small media enterprises can, theoretically, access professional

media services which would otherwise divert resources from the core business of generating content. However, it remains to be seen whether search media deliver on the implied promise that media diversity, arising from proliferating sole traders and small businesses, including blog authors and the new forms of citizen-journalism they support, will be the major beneficiary of these new advertising management technologies.

The strategic value of small advertisers to the new search media is considerable. However, a tension between their strategic and economic value is also indicated. The economic case for media to organise around the requirements of large advertisers may ultimately prove as irresistible to many new media as it was for modern mass media. Indeed, national and transnational advertisers probably already hold sway over the development paths of new search media to the extent that they are overwhelmingly the largest online media spenders. According to research commissioned by the US chapter of the IAB, small advertisers accounted for only 6 percent of total online ad expenditure in 2004 (PriceWaterHouseCoopers). This also means that caution is advisable when evaluating the influence of the non-commercial cultural origins of the new search media.

Certainly there are significant differences between the systemic control architectures of the internet and those of modern mass media. The heavy reliance of new search media on advertising revenues, combined with consumer tolerance, if not desire, for informational advertising, suggests that advertising content, in and of itself, is not the only reason why audiences might be opting out of mass media. Access to new communication tools which afford greater control over increased media, communication, information and entertainment choices are also significant influences. In any event, as audiences have begun to wander to new media in significant numbers, advertisers, now prompted by the arguments of the IAB movement, are following.

With the genie of end-user control finally released, there is an important role for new media studies in tracking this civilising influence on capital. As shown here, we can already see some important effects, both in the configuration of new media so that control over advertising exposure is shifted in the direction of end-users, and in the accessibility of new media to all advertisers, not just to large advertisers. However, the formation of the IAB also reminds us that the coincidence of end-user and online publisher interests in advertiser-funded media has limits. The influence of end-users in this equation may not be as stable as advertisers, publishers or governments might claim or wish. Nevertheless, forecasts of the death of advertising that have been emanating from advocates of integrated marketing communication for more than a decade also seem premature. Advertiser-funded media are alive and well in the global era, and co-evolving.

## References

Audit Bureau of Verification Services (2005) 'Online advertising market grows revenue to \$488 million', *Media Release*, 5 September.

- Castells, M. (2001) *The Internet Galaxy. Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Google (2004) *Securities and Exchange Commission Registration Statement*, Google Inc, 18 August 2004, p. 51, available at [http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1288776/000119312504142742/ds1a.htm#toc59330\\_11](http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1288776/000119312504142742/ds1a.htm#toc59330_11) (accessed 4 September 2005).
- Interactive Advertising Bureau UK (c2005), *Fact Sheet: online adspend full year 2004*, available at: ADD URL (accessed 23 September 2005).
- Marshall, P. David (2004) *New Media Cultures*. London: Arnold.
- Mattelart, A. (2002) *Advertising International*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Milnes, N. (2005) personal interview, 11 August.
- Ogilvy, D. (2004) *Confessions of an Advertising Man*. London: Southbank Publishing.
- PriceWaterHouseCoopers (c2004) *IAB Internet Advertising Revenue Report*, Internet Advertising Bureau USA, available at: ADD URL (accessed 23 September 2005).
- Raphael, J., Bacey, C., and Clark, K. (2003) 'Yellow Pages', *Advertising Age Encyclopedia of Advertising*, Vol 3, New York and London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Spurgeon, C. (2003) 'Classified advertising and the 'new' services economy: implications for newspapers', *Australian Journalism Review*, Vol. 25(2):51-62.
- Telstra (2004) *Annual Report*, available at: [http://www.telstra.com.au/abouttelstra/investor/annual\\_reports.cfm?ReportDate=2004&ReportType=1](http://www.telstra.com.au/abouttelstra/investor/annual_reports.cfm?ReportDate=2004&ReportType=1) (accessed 6 September 2005).
- Turner, G. (2004) 'Audience Decline', in, J. Sinclair (ed) *Contemporary World Television*. London: British Film Institute.
- Sinclair, L. (2005) 'Google irks agencies with ad reward plan', Media Supplement, *The Australian*, Thursday 10 November, p. 17.
- Yahoo!, *Annual Report*, (1997), (2000), (2004), available at: <http://yhoo.client.shareholder.com/annual.cfm> (accessed 6 September 2005).

### **Author note**

Dr Christina Spurgeon lectures in Media and Communication in the Creative Industries Faculty at QUT.

### **Acknowledgements**

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of Professor Graeme Turner and the Centre for Critical Cultural Studies at University of Queensland for providing a wonderful writing environment; as well as the support and encouragement of senior Creative Industries colleagues and co-collaborators in an Australian Research Council Discovery investigation of the internationalisation of creative industries, including Distinguished Professor John Hartley, Professor Stuart Cunningham, Associate Professor Terry Flew and Dr Michael Keane.